

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,307) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,074).

Claims 6, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha and Kim et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8 and 14 and cancelled claims 4, 11 and 17 to further define the invention. Claims 22 and 25 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-15, 18-21 and 23-24 are pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, 1-2, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha in view of Kim et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as being based upon references, whether taken singly or combined, that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited by independent claims 1, 8 and 14 as amended, and hence dependent claims 1-2, 5, 7-9, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 23-24.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "a second dummy line connected to the data lines and the common voltage lines through the static

electricity preventing units.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 3, 11, 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claim 1 includes the limitation of claims 3, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2, 5 and 7 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 5 and 7 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 1, which is allowable.

Independent claims 8 recite a combination of elements, including, for example, “a second dummy line connected to the data lines and the common voltage lines through the static electricity preventing units.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 3, 11, 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claim 8 includes the limitation of claims 11, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 9 and 12 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 9 and 12 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 8, which is allowable.

Independent claims 14 recite a combination of elements, including, for example, “a second dummy line connected to the data lines and the common voltage lines through the static electricity preventing unit.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 3, 11, 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claim 14 includes the limitation of claims 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is allowable over the cited references.

In the Office Action, claim 6, 13 and 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ha in view of Kim et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 6, 13 and 19 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 6, 13 and 19 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend respectively from claims 1, 8 and 14, which are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests the entry of this Amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: May 27, 2008

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000
Fax: (202) 739-3001